
Site Address:	23 St Andrews Road, Hayling Island, PO11 9JN		
Proposal:	Two storey front extension. Alterations to external facade of existing building including walls and tiles .		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/22/00566	Expiry Date:	04/10/2022
Applicant:	Mr Bradley Till		
Agent:	Mr Kelly	Case Officer:	Gary Christie
	GRK Architecture		
Ward:	Hayling East		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

This application relates to a modestly sized bungalow located to the eastern side of St Andrews Road, Hayling Island. The property is set back in its plot in comparison to its neighbours to the north and south with a long front garden/driveway and a smaller garden to the rear. Narrow passageways providing access into the rear garden offer a small degree of separation to the shared boundaries. Internally the property comprises a living room, kitchen bathroom and two bedrooms. Externally the property is finished in brickwork with a clay tiled roof with gables facing east and west. A row of trees protected by Tree Preservation Order mark the boundary with properties to the west.

St Andrews Road is characterised by a varied mix of detached dwellinghouses and no distinct style predominates. The majority of properties are single-storey, although some have been extended upwards with accommodation within enlarged roof spaces and some are two-storey. A large area of open space is located immediately to the east and a later housing estate comprising 2-storey dwellings of a more uniform appearance are located to the south-east.

2 Planning History

03/68486/000 - Application to reduce 2 limbs on the eastern sector of an Oak and to reduce 1 limb on the eastern sector of another Oak (both within Group G1) subject to TPO 1808., PERM,26/06/2003

APP/16/01187 - Single storey rear extension., PERM,02/02/2017

APP/18/00250 - Crown reduce 3No. Oaks by 2m. Subject to G1 of TPO 1808., PERM,05/04/2018

APP/18/00924 - Removal of 1No. branch (northern sector), overhanging 23 St Andrews Road. Subject to TPO 1808., PERM,15/11/2018

3 Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a two-storey extension to the front of the property with alterations to the existing property.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS15 (Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16 (High Quality Design)
CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Submission Version Havant Local Plan

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist

No Comments Received.

Councillor Leah Turner - Hayling East

No Comments Received.

Councillor M Wilson - Hayling East

No Comments Received.

Councillor R Raines - Hayling East

No Comments Received.

6 Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 4

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
Whilst we remain amicable towards the applicant, who has been open, in part, to his planned development, we would like to raise the following objections regarding the designs submitted in August 2022. Height Privacy Light, Overshadowing Bulky appearance Harmful to street character Height As seen in the Proposed plans to 'East Elevation', the property is higher by a considerable amount to the adjoining properties of 21A and 25 St. Andrews Road. This would make the property the highest in the street by far, as viewed by perspective from Mengham Park, opposite, where you are able to view almost the entire street length. Privacy Whilst we acknowledge, some consideration has been made towards ensuring there are no clear windows on the North Elevation of the property, we still consider there to be an impact to our privacy from the large and high, floor to ceiling Window, indicated on the West Elevation on the Second-Floor plan along with two west facing windows on the First-Floor plan. All these windows would look directly into our back garden, where we currently have no property overlooking so have complete privacy. Light, Overshadowing Linked again with the overall height is the impact to the available light currently afforded, due to the current arc of the sun, especially in the months September to March. One of us runs a	Comments addressed in Section 7 below.

design and photographic business from home, most of the work is done within the conservatory at the rear and natural light is essential. The overshadowing of a two-storey building and large dormer windows would leave this space with reduced light in addition to the overall light towards our entire South-facing elevation. The proposed length of doubling the existing building length would block natural light in five windows across our south facing side of our property and conservatory.

Bulky Appearance

The design appears to be too bulky and imposing considering the size of the plot. Whilst the applicant informed us that he would be developing to the East of the current building, he did not indicate this as the intended size.

Respecting our request not to add an additional floor to the current existing property, we feel he has simply added two additional storeys at the front and added two dormer windows facing north. The length of the proposed property extends so far East it reaches towards the narrowest part of the boundary which measures a maximum of 1.05m from wall to fence.

Harmful to street character

The design is inconsistent to existing close neighbours and the overall aesthetics to the local street where there are no other three-storey properties. This development would set a new precedent for individual houses, which would change the scale and character of the street scene.

Summary.

We understand that some development of 23 St. Andrews Road is acceptable and the applicant is a good neighbour but we do believe this design is too large in height and imposing length for the plot size. Encroaching on all neighbours and reducing light and privacy for all three directions.

In regards to our back garden privacy concerns, we must insist on sufficient

frosting to any windows facing this area and to ensure the windows do not open to an extent which would overlook us.	
We wish to raise the following objections to the proposed development of No 23 St Andrews Road: Daylight The proposed development will make the No 23 considerably higher than our property and extends well beyond the front of our house, this will impact the daylight we have coming into our stairwell, upstairs landing and downstairs hallway. It will significantly reduce the light we currently enjoy in these areas, which will become quite dark and gloomy inside. In addition, the following areas will also suffer loss of daylight: utility room, downstairs office, and front upstairs bedroom, back garden and side access alleyway & front of house in courtyard. Privacy The large window proposed at the rear of the of the property will overlook our garden, proposed on the second floor is an oversized window, this will look all adjoining properties, North, South and West. We strongly request the size of the window is reduced both in height and width to allow us to retain our privacy in our back garden that we have enjoyed for over 20 years. As the proposed plans currently stand our hot tub (in place for over 20 years) will be overlooked. Outlook The from our front bedroom currently overlooks the park, this outlook will be reduced because proposed development comes significantly beyond the front of our house. This room will also suffer with loss of light. Design and Appearance The proposed development is a large 5-bedroom house over 3 floors on what is a relatively small and narrow plot that currently sits a small 2-bedroom bungalow. The proposed building is	Comments addressed in Section 7 below.

over 300% larger than the original bungalow. The new design will change the line of properties in the road, and is out of character with the road. There are no other 3 storey properties in the road and the proposed height is significantly higher than the adjoining properties. Such a large building will look very cramped on to the plot and be detrimental to the look and feel of the road.

Many people use St Andrews Road to access the park, this proposed development looks onto. We feel it is important not to substantially change the character of the road.

Parking

The proposed plans show parking for 3 cars. The frontage of this area is 8.1m, as stated in 'Boundary Alignment Assessment Inspection Survey. Frisby & Small LLP'. 2019.

UK norm for parking spaces is 2.4 metres wide by 4.8 metres long. $2.4 \times 3 = 7.2$. This leaves 0.9m access for all other requirements. Realistically it is parking for 2 cars and should be adjusted as such.

To reduce the impact on the neighbourhood, the road can get very busy at the weekends with the park in use for football, we request the council restrict the hours of work to reduce disturbance to residents and other neighbours.

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Parking
- (v) Flood Risk

- (i) Principle of development

- 7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

- 7.3 The application seeks planning permission for the construction of a two-storey front extension with additional living accommodation within the roof space. The extension, measuring approximately 9.5m deep by 6m wide, would more than double the footprint of the existing dwelling and increase the total floor area by approximately 300%.
- 7.4 Externally the extension would have a simple form with dual-pitched roof forming gables to the east and west facing elevations to match the form and roof pitch of the existing dwelling. The east elevation would include two sets of doors at ground floor level with large floor to ceiling windows at first floor level. The west facing elevation would include two windows at first floor level and a fully glazed gable at second floor level. Other than an entrance door and a small dormer projection to provide height over a stairwell, there would be no windows to the north and south facing elevations. The extension would measure approximately 6m at the eaves and 8.5m at the ridge. The entire building would be finished with a white render, dark grey roof tiles, dark grey windows and rainwater goods, and cedar cladding to a gable feature.
- 7.5 The existing portion of the enlarged dwelling would be remodelled with the removal of all windows from the north and south facing elevations, the installation of large bi-fold doors to the west facing elevation and a rendered finish with new roof tiles to match the extension.
- 7.6 Policy CS16 of the Havant Local Plan states that permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design:

1. Responds to, draws inspiration from and respects local context and:

- a) Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site;
- b) Integrates with existing local landscape features, promotes wildlife and biodiversity and/or applies characteristics of the local area into the design of a scheme wherever possible to create variety and interest;
- c) Uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors;...
- e) The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking.

- 7.7 The National Planning Policy Framework also gives the following guidance:

Paragraph 130. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments: a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.....

Paragraph 134. Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design,

taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to: a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.

7.8 The Borough's Design Guide SPD states:

'5.35 In general, an extension should not be bigger than the main building and therefore should appear smaller in mass and height. Extensions should look to the existing building as the main reference point for appearance, materials and details such ridge, verge and eave finishes, head and cills, brick coursing, dressings and quoin work. The positions and proportions of solid wall to opening of windows and doors is also important. The roof form and slope should also reflect that of the main building.

5.36 Front extensions should not protrude too far forward from the main building, or be prominent in the street and should respect the common building line. Front extensions are therefore most appropriate where the building is set well back from the street, where there is a staggered building line, or in isolated countryside locations. Two storey front extensions will only be acceptable where the building is set well back from the street'.

- 7.9 The application dwelling is currently set back within its plot. No.21a to the south is set slightly further forward and includes a detached fully hipped double garage within its front garden against the boundary with the application site. No.25 to the north is a more substantial building and is again set further forward in its plot than both the application dwelling and No.21a. No.25 was designed as a chalet bungalow but has been enlarged at roof level and includes a 2-storey element along the shared boundary with the application site, albeit the second floor is topped with a shallow pitched roof which is only very slightly taller than the roof of the original bungalow. With the exception of two properties to the north which are sited within wider plots, all of the dwellings within the road are either bungalows or chalet bungalows.
- 7.10 The set back of the existing property limits its presence in the street in comparison to other properties, and views of it are restricted to positions directly to the east. The extension would bring the building line forward approximately halfway between the eastern building lines of Nos.21a and 25 creating an appropriate stepped building line in visual terms. However, the proposed extension at a full 2-storeys, with further accommodation within a roof space, would result in a building that is taller than its neighbours both at eaves and ridge level resulting in one of the tallest buildings in the road, and within the narrowest plot. This would be prominent in views from both the east and south where the large blank rendered elevation would clearly be visible above the double garage at No.21a.
- 7.11 In isolation, despite the significant increase in floor area, the relationship of the proposed extension with the recipient building is not considered unreasonable and the modern design approach would not necessarily be harmful given the range of property styles within the street. However, it is considered that as a result of its combined height, projection forward in the plot, plot width, separation distances to its neighbours and large expanse of unrelieved white rendered façade to the south, the extension

would result in an incongruous, overly dominant and cramped form of development that would compete visually and disrupt the pattern of development within the streetscene to the detriment of the character of the surrounding area.

- 7.12 The applicant was advised at pre-application stage that the LPA was not convinced that a two-storey building could be accommodated at the site having regard to the specific site constraints. Whilst the proposed development has been scaled back slightly to the rear above the existing dwelling, it remains a full two-storey and projects further forward than that seen at pre-application stage. It is considered that the building has been designed to maximise internal floorspace and without having full regard to the specific site constraints. As a result the development causes harm both visually and in amenity terms, as discussed below.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.10 To the north, No.25 is positioned at a slight angle to the shared boundary set in between 1 and 1.5 metres. To its south facing elevation No.25 incorporates a large conservatory window to the rear (also benefiting from west facing glazing), a window serving a lounge leading to a kitchen and the conservatory, a window serving stairs /landing and a sole window serving a converted garage. Representations suggest that this room to the front of the property is used as an office for home working. All of the south facing windows look out on to a 2m high timber fence but benefit from some views of the sky above. At first floor level a small south facing window serves the stairs and a large window towards the front of the house serves a bedroom which also benefits from a large east facing window.
- 7.11 The proposed extension would be positioned 1.2m from the shared boundary, approximately 2.2 - 2.7m from the southern façade of No.25 and extending eastwards to finish approximately in line with the western edge of the first floor bedroom window at No.25. The pattern of development in the road is such that properties generally sit alongside each other and have limited light and outlook to their side elevations as a result. Here the relationship is more unusual and No.25 currently benefits from a good degree of light and outlook towards the south across the application site.
- 7.12 All of the south facing windows at No.25 would be affected by the development at various times of the day. The impact on the first floor bedroom window would be limited to later in the day and given the good degree of light and outlook afforded by both the east and south facing window, it is not considered that the loss of light to this window would be unacceptable. However, there would be some short distance intervisibility between this bedroom window and the large glazed elements on the east elevation of the extension that would result in some privacy concerns.
- 7.13 Notwithstanding the view above, it is considered that the impact of the development on the other south facing habitable room windows at No.25, as a result of overall height and proximity, would be significantly harmful resulting in a loss of light, outlook and an increased sense of enclosure. The 2-storey element of the extension projecting beyond the main rear elevation of No.25 would also affect the use of the rear garden resulting in overshadowing and appearing intrusive and overbearing. Whilst some overlooking of rear gardens within urban areas is to be expected, a fully glazed gable at such an elevated level would also result in a loss of privacy both actual and perceived.
- 7.14 To the south, the proposed extension would be positioned approximately 1.2m from

the shared boundary with No.21A which itself is set in approximately 1.8m. This boundary is also formed by 2m high timber fence panels. To the north facing elevation, No.21A incorporates a utility room window/door and a kitchen window, which is also served both windows/doors on the west facing elevation, and a stairwell window at first floor level.

- 7.15 Having regard to the relative position of No.21A to the proposed extension and the position of its windows on a north facing elevation serving a utility room, stairwell and secondary kitchen window, it is not considered that the proposed extension would result in a significant loss of light or outlook to the occupiers of No.21A. The flank wall of the two-storey extension would certainly be perceptible to the occupiers of No.21A at the front of their property and above their double garage. However having regard to the stepped relationship, position to the north and presence of the existing detached garage, it is not considered that the extension would result in significant harm to the occupiers of No.21A in terms of loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or increased sense of enclosure. As with the garden at No.25, the presence of the fully glazed gable at such an elevated position would increase opportunities for overlooking which would be harmful.
- 7.16 It is noted that No.21A is currently the subject of a planning application (APP/22/00695). However, this is pending consideration and does not materially affect the determination of this application for No.23.
- 7.17 There are no dwellings to the east, and dwellings to the west are well separated and screened to a significant degree by the presence of protected trees. As such it is not considered that the proposal would result in harm to the amenity of nearby residents to the east or west.

(iv) Parking

- 7.18 The existing dwellinghouse comprises two-bedrooms with a large front garden that can comfortably accommodate a number of vehicles. The enlarged dwellinghouse would comprise 5 bedrooms. The Parking SPD sets the level of parking provision expected within new developments, including extensions to existing, requiring 3 parking spaces measuring 2.4m by 4.8m for a dwelling comprising 5-bedrooms.

The submitted drawings show a parking plan with three vehicles positioned to the front of the property side by side, technically meeting the requirements of the parking standards. However, this would leave very little space to access the property past parked vehicles on foot or bicycle, would prevent the inclusion of a boundary treatment and would visually dominate the front of the plot. This would exacerbate the cramped appearance of the dwelling and visual impact on the character of the streetscene.

(v) Flood Risk

- 7.19 The application site is located within the indicative floodplain, Flood Zone 3. The application is not supported by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) to demonstrate how the development would address the issues of flood risk and ensure that the risk of flooding is not increased at the site or elsewhere. As such, the LPA is unable to conclude that the development would be acceptable in flood risk terms.
- 7.20 On the basis the development is considered to be unacceptable in design and amenity terms and does not reflect the advice provided at pre-application site including that relating to flood risk, an FRA has not been requested.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The application dwelling is slightly unusual in terms of its scale and position set back well into its plot. The principle of extending the dwelling forward to create a stepped footprint with its neighbours to the north and south is accepted. However, as a result of its overall scale, design, plot width and siting in close proximity to neighbouring properties, the resultant dwelling would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and significantly impact the living conditions of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore, contrary to the principles of good design set out within the National Planning Policy Framework, The Borough Design Guide SPD and the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/22/00566 for the following reasons/subject to the following conditions

- 1 The proposed extension would, by virtue of its combined height, projection forward in its plot, siting in close proximity to neighbouring properties, use of materials, large unrelieved elevations particularly to the south and dominance of parked vehicles, result in an incongruous, overly dominant, cramped and unneighbourly form of development that would compete visually and disrupt the pattern of development within the streetscene to the detriment of the character of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore, contrary to the aims and objectives of the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011, Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
- 2 The proposed extension would, by virtue of its combined height, projection forward in its plot, siting in close proximity to its neighbour to the north and the inclusion of large expanses of glazing at elevated levels, result in an overly dominant and unneighbourly form of development that would have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, outlook, increased sense of enclosure, overbearing impact (to No.25 St Andrews Road) and increased overlooking and loss of privacy (both 21A and 25). The proposal is therefore, contrary to the aims and objectives of the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011, Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
- 3 The application site is located within Flood Zone 3. In the absence of a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, the Local Planning Authority is unable to determine whether the enlarged dwelling would be safe in flood risk terms or whether the proposal would increase the risk of flooding at the site or elsewhere. The proposal is therefore, contrary to the requirements of Policy

CS15 and of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).